arXiv:1403.3389v3 [math.AP] 20 Nov 2014

Multi-marginal Monge-Kantorovich transport problems: A characterization of solutions
Problèmes de transport multi-marginal de Monge-Kantorovich: Une caractérisation des solutions

Abbas Moameni *
School of Mathematics and Statistics
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON, Canada K1S 5B6
momeni@math.carleton.ca

November 21, 2014

Abstract

We shall present a measure theoretical approach for which together with the Kantorovich duality provide an efficient tool to study the optimal transport problem. Specifically, we study the support of optimal plans where the cost function does not satisfy the classical twist condition in the two marginal problem as well as in the multi-marginal case when twistedness is limited to certain subsets.

Résumé

Dans cet article, nous étudions le problème de transport optimal du point de vue de la théorie de la mesure, à l'aide de la dualité de Kantorovich. En particulier, nous étudions le support des plans optimaux où la fonction coût ne satisfait pas la condition de "twist" dans le problème à deux marginales, ainsi que dans le cas multi-marginale quand la condition "twist" est limitée à des sous-ensembles précis.

1 Introduction

We consider the Monge-Kantorovich transport problem for Borel probability measures $\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_n$ on smooth manifolds $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n$. The cost function $c : X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n \to \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and continuous. Let $\Pi(\mu_1, ..., \mu_n)$ be the set of Borel probability measures on $X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n$ which have X_i-marginal μ_i for each $i \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$. The transport cost associated to a transport plan $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, ..., \mu_n)$ is given by

$$I_c(\pi) = \int_{X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n} c(x_1, ..., x_n)\, d\pi.$$

We consider the Monge-Kantorovich transport problem,

$$\inf\{I_c(\pi); \pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, ..., \mu_n)\}. \qquad (MK)$$

If a transport plan minimizes the cost, it will be called an optimal plan. We say that an optimal plan γ induces a Monge solution if it is concentrated on the graph $\{(x, T(x); x \in X_1\}$ of a measurable map $T : X_1 \to X_2 \times ... \times X_n$. In contrary to the Monge problem, the Kantorovich problem always admits

*Supported by a grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

solutions as soon as the cost function is a non-negative lower semi continuous function (see [17] for a proof). When $n = 2$, a general criterion for existence and uniqueness of an optimal transport map known as the twist condition dictates the map $y \to D_1c(x, y)$ to be injective for fixed $x \in X_1$. Under the twist condition and the absolute continuity of μ_1, the optimal plan γ which solves the Monge-Kantorovich problem (MK) is supported on the graph of an optimal transport map T, i.e., $\gamma = (\mathrm{Id} \times T)_{\#}\mu$. For larger n, questions regarding the existence and uniqueness are not fully understood yet. By now there are many interesting results for the multi-marginal problem in the general case as well as particular models (see for instance [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15], the bibliography is not exhaustive). When $n > 2$, as shown in [10], the twist condition can be replaced by twistedness on c-splitting sets.

Definition 1.1 *A set $S \subset X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n$ is a c-splitting set if there exists Borel functions $u_i : X_i \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i(x_i) \leq c(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$$

with equality whenever $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in S$. The n-tuple $(u_1, ..., u_n)$ is called the c-splitting tuple for S.

In [12], for the case $n = 2$, the author relaxed the twist condition by a new property, i.e.,

- Generalized-twist condition: We say that c satisfies the generalized-twist condition if for any $\bar{x}_1 \in X_1$ and $\bar{x}_2 \in X_2$ the set $L_{(\bar{x}_1,\bar{x}_2)} := \{x_2 \in X_2;\, D_1c(\bar{x}_1, x_2) = D_1c(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)\}$ is a finite subset of X_2. Moreover, if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $\bar{x}_1 \in X_1$ and $\bar{x}_2 \in X_2$ the cardinality of the set $L_{(\bar{x}_1,\bar{x}_2)}$ does not exceed m then we say that c satisfies the m-twist condition.

Under the m-twist condition, it is shown that for each optimal plan γ of (MK), there exist a sequence of non-negative measurable real functions $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m$ on X_1 with $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$ and, Borel measurable maps $G_1, ..., G_m : X_1 \to X_2$ such that $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i(\mathrm{Id} \times G_i)_{\#}\mu$.
Our aim in this work is to extend this result to the multi-marginal case. For the rest of the paper we always assume that c is non-negative, lower semi-continuous, $\oplus_{i=1}^n \mu_i$-a.e. differentiable with respect to the first variable and that $I_c(\gamma)$ is finite for some transport plan γ. We also assume that the Kantorovich dual problem admits a solution $(\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n)$ such that φ_1 is differentiable μ_1-a.e., $\varphi_1(x_1)+...+\varphi_n(x_n) \leq c(x_1, ..., x_n)$ for all $(x_1, ..., x_n)$ and

$$\int c\, d\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{X_i} \varphi_i(x_i)\, d\mu_i.$$

We denote by $D_1(c)$ the set of points at which c is differentiable with respect to the first variable. The generalized twist structure takes the following form in the multi-marginal case.

Definition 1.2 *Let c be a Borel measurable function.*
1. **m-twist condition:** *Say that c is m-twisted on c-splitting sets if for any c-splitting set $S \subset X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n$ and any $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, ..., \bar{x}_n) \in S \cap D_1(c)$ the cardinality of the set*

$$\Big\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in S \cap D_1(c);\, D_{x_1}c(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, ..., \bar{x}_n) = D_{x_1}c(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ..., x_n)\Big\},$$

is at most m.
2. **Generalized-twist condition:** *Say that c satisfies the generalized twist condition on c-splitting sets if for any c-splitting set $S \subset X_1 \times X_2 \times ... \times X_n$ and any $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, ..., \bar{x}_n) \in S \cap D_1(c)$ the set*

$$\Big\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in S \cap D_1(c);\, D_{x_1}c(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, ..., \bar{x}_n) = D_{x_1}c(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ..., x_n)\Big\},$$

is a finite subset of S.

The following result provides a connection between the generalized twist condition and the local 1-twistedness.

Proposition 1.1 *Assume that c is continuously differentiable with respect to the first variable and S is a compact c-splitting set. If c is locally 1-twisted on S then c satisfies the generalized-twist condition on S.*

We now state our main result in this paper.

Theorem 1.3 *Assume that the cost function c satisfies the m-twist condition on c-splitting sets and μ_1 is non-atomic. Then for each optimal plan γ of (MK) with $Supp(\gamma) \subset D_1(c)$, there exist $k \leq m$, a sequence of non-negative measurable real functions $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^k$ on X_1 and, Borel measurable maps $G_1, ..., G_k : X_1 \to X_2 \times ... \times X_n$ such that*

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i (Id \times G_i)_{\#}\mu, \tag{1}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i(x) = 1$ for μ_1-a.e. $x \in X_1$

We also have the following for the generalized-twist condition.

Proposition 1.2 *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, if one replaces the m-twist condition by the generalized -twist condition then each optimal plan γ of (MK) is of the form (1) with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

As shown in [12], the most interesting examples of costs satisfying the generalized-twist condition are non-degenerate costs on smooth n-dimensional manifolds X and Y. Denote by $D^2_{xy}c(x_0, y_0)$ the $n \times n$ matrix of mixed second order partial derivatives of the function c at the point (x_0, y_0). A cost $c \in C^2(X \times Y)$ is non-degenerate provided $D^2_{xy}c(x_0, y_0)$ is non-singular, that is $\det\Big(D^2_{xy}c(x_0, y_0)\Big) \neq 0$. In our forthcoming work [13], following an idea in [15] together with Proposition 1.1, a differential condition similar to the non-degeneracy condition (in $n = 2$) is derived for the multi-marginal case that guaranties the general twist property on c-splitting sets and consequently the characterization of the support of optimal plans due to Theorem 1.3.
In the next section, we shall discuss the key ingredients for our methodology in this work. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the main results,

2 Measurable sections and extremality

Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ be a finite, not necessarily complete measure space, and (Y, Σ) a measurable space. The completion of $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to μ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_\mu$, when necessary, we identify μ with its completion on $\mathcal{B}_\mu$. The push forward of the measure μ by a map $T : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \to (Y, \Sigma)$ is denoted by $T_{\#}\mu$, i.e.

$$T_{\#}\mu(A) = \mu(T^{-1}(A)), \qquad \forall A \in \Sigma.$$

Definition 2.1 *Let $T : X \to Y$ be $(\mathcal{B}, \Sigma)$-measurable and ν a positive measure on Σ. We call a map $F : Y \to X$ a $(\Sigma_\nu, \mathcal{B})$-measurable section of T if F is $(\Sigma_\nu, \mathcal{B})$- measurable and $T \circ F = Id_Y$.*

If X is a topological space we denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ the set of Borel sets on X. The space of Borel probability measures on a topological space X is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(X)$. For a measurable map $T : (X, \mathcal{B}(X)) \to (Y, \Sigma, \nu)$ denote by $\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ the set of all measures λ on $\mathcal{B}$ so that T pushes λ forward to ν, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}(T, \nu) = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(X);\, T_{\#}\lambda = \nu\}.$$

Evidently $\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ is a convex set. A measure λ is an extreme point of $\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ if the identity $\lambda = \theta\lambda_1 + (1 - \theta)\lambda_2$ with $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ imply that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. The set of extreme points of $\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ is denoted by $ext\,\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$.

We recall the following result from [8] in which a characterization of the set $ext\,\mathcal{M}(T, \nu)$ is given.

Theorem 2.2 *Let (Y, Σ, ν) be a probability space, $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ be a Hausdorff space with a Radon probability measure λ, and let $T : X \to Y$ be an $(\mathcal{B}(X), \Sigma)$-measurable mapping. Assume that T is surjective and Σ is countably separated. The following conditions are equivalent:*
(i) λ is an extreme point of $M(T, \nu)$;
(ii) there exists a $(\Sigma_\nu, \mathcal{B}(X))$-measurable section $F : Y \to X$ of the mapping T with $\lambda = F_{\#}\nu$.

By making use of the Choquet theory in the setting of noncompact sets of measures [18], each $\lambda \in M(T,\nu)$ can be represented as a Choquet type integral over $ext\, M(T,\nu)$. Denote by $\Sigma_{ext\, M(T,\nu)}$ the σ-algebra over $ext\, M(T,\nu)$ generated by the functions $\varrho \to \varrho(B)$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. We have the following result (see [12] for a proof).

Theorem 2.3 *Let X and Y be complete separable metric spaces and ν a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(Y)$. Let $T : (X, \mathcal{B}(X)) \to (Y, \mathcal{B}(Y))$ be a surjective measurable mapping and let $\lambda \in M(T,\nu)$. Then there exists a probability measure ξ on $\sum_{ext\, M(T,\nu)}$ such that for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$,*

$$\lambda(B) = \int_{ext\, M(T,\nu)} \varrho(B)\, d\xi(\varrho), \qquad \big(\varrho \to \varrho(B) \text{ is measurable}\big).$$

3 Proofs.

In this section we shall proceed with the proofs of the statements in the introduction. We first state some preliminaries required for the proofs. Let γ be a solution of (MK) such that $Supp(\gamma) \subset D_1(c)$. It is standard that $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, ..., \mu_n)$ is non-atomic if and only if at least one μ_i is non-atomic (see for instance [16]). Set $Y = X_2 \times ... \times X_n$. Since μ_1 is non-atomic it follows that the Borel measurable spaces $(X_1, \mathcal{B}(X_1), \mu_1)$ and $(X_1 \times Y, \mathcal{B}(X_1 \times Y), \gamma)$ are isomorphic. Thus, there exists an isomorphism $T = (T_1, T_2, ..., T_n)$ from $(X_1, \mathcal{B}(X_1), \mu_1)$ onto $(X_1 \times Y, \mathcal{B}(X_1 \times Y), \gamma)$. It can be easily deduced that $T_i : X_1 \to X_i$ are surjective maps and

$$T_i \# \mu_1 = \mu_i, \qquad i = 1, 2, ..., n.$$

Consider the convex set

$$\mathcal{M}(T_1, \mu_1) = \big\{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(X_1);\, T_1 \# \lambda = \mu_1\big\},$$

and note that $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}(T_1, \mu_1)$. The following definition and proposition are essential in the sequel (see [12] for a proof).

Definition 3.1 *Denote by $\mathcal{S}(T_1)$ the set of all sections of T_1. Let $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{S}(T_1)$. We say that a measurable function $F : \big(X, \mathcal{B}(X)_\mu\big) \to \big(X, \mathcal{B}(X)\big)$ is generated by $\mathcal{K}$ if there exist a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $X = \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i$ where*

$$A_i = \{x \in X;\ F(x) = F_i(x)\}.$$

We also denote by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ the set of all functions generated by $\mathcal{K}$. It is easily seen that $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{S}(T_1)$.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{S}(T_1)$. Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ such that the following assertions hold:*

i. for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \le k$ we have $\mu(B_i) > 0$ where $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is defined recursively as follows

$$B_1 = X \quad \& \quad B_{i+1} = \Big\{x \in B_i;\ F_{i+1}(x) \notin \{F_1(x), ..., F_i(x)\}\Big\} \quad \text{provided } k > 1.$$

ii. For all $F \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ we have

$$\mu\Big\{x \in B_{i+1}^c \setminus B_i^c;\ F(x) \notin \{F_1(x), ..., F_i(x)\}\Big\} = 0.$$

iii. If $k \neq \infty$ then for all $F \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$

$$\mu\Big\{x \in B_k;\ F(x) \notin \{F_1(x), ..., F_k(x)\}\Big\} = 0.$$

Moreover, if either $k \neq \infty$ or $k = \infty$ and $\mu(\cap_{i=1}^\infty B_i) = 0$ then for every $F \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ the measure $\varrho_F = F_\# \mu$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure $\sum_{i=1}^k \varrho_i$ where $\varrho_i = F_{i\#}\mu$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Since $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}(T_1, \mu_1)$, it follows from Theorem 2.3 that there exists a probability measure ξ on $\sum_{ext\, M(T_1,\mu_1)}$ such that for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(X_1)$,

$$\mu(B) = \int_{ext\, M(T_1,\mu_1)} \varrho(B)\, d\xi(\varrho), \qquad \big(\varrho \to \varrho(B) \text{ is measurable}\big). \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, there exist functions $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $\varphi_1(x_1) + ... + \varphi_n(x_n) \leq c(x_1, ..., x_n)$, φ_1 is μ_1-a.e. differentiable, and that

$$\int c\, d\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{X_i} \varphi_i(x_i)\, d\mu_i.$$

Let S be the c-splitting set generated by the n-tuple $(\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n)$, that is,

$$S = \{(x_1, ..., x_n);\, c(x_1, ..., x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i(x_i)\}.$$

As $T = (T_1, T_2, ..., T_n)$ is an isomorphism from $(X_1, \mathcal{B}(X_1), \mu_1)$ onto $(X_1 \times Y, \mathcal{B}(X_1 \times Y), \gamma)$, it follows that

$$\int_{X_1} c(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1)\, d\mu_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{X_1} \varphi_i(T_ix_1)\, d\mu_1.$$

from which together with the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i(x_i) \leq c(x_1, ..., x_n)$ we obtain

$$c(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i(T_ix_1). \qquad \mu_1 - a.e. \tag{3}$$

Since φ_1 is μ almost surely differentiable and $T_{1\#}\mu_1 = \mu_1$, it follows that

$$D_1c(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1) = \nabla\varphi_1(T_1x_1) \qquad \mu_1 - a.e. \tag{4}$$

where D_1c stands for the partial derivative of c with respect to the first variable. Let $A_\gamma \in \mathcal{B}(X_1)$ be the set with $\mu(A_\gamma) = 1$ such that (3) and (4) hold for all $x_1 \in A_\gamma$, i.e.

$$c(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i(T_ix_1) \quad \& \quad D_1c(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1) = \nabla\varphi_1(T_1x_1) \qquad \forall x_1 \in A_\gamma. \tag{5}$$

Since $\mu_1(X_1 \setminus A_\gamma) = 0$, it follows from (2) that

$$\int_{ext\, M(T_1,\mu_1)} \varrho(X_1 \setminus A_\gamma)\, d\xi(\varrho) = \mu(X_1 \setminus A_\gamma) = 0,$$

and therefore there exists a ξ-full measure subset K_γ of $ext\, M(T_1, \mu_1)$ such that $\varrho(X_1 \setminus A_\gamma) = 0$ for all $\varrho \in K_\gamma$. Let us now define

$$\mathcal{K} := \big\{F \in \mathcal{S}(T_1);\ \exists \varrho \in K_\gamma \text{ with } \mu = F_\#\varrho\big\},$$

where $\mathcal{S}(T_1)$ is the set of all sections of T_1. Let $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ be the set of all sections of T_1 generated by $\mathcal{K}$ as in Definition 3.1. By Proposition 3.1, there exists a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{K})$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying conditions $(i), (ii)$ and (iii) in that proposition.

Claim. We have that $k \leq m$.
To prove the claim assume that $k > m$ and for each $1 \leq n \leq m+1$ let $\varrho_n = F_{n\#}\mu$. It follows from (5) that

$$D_1c\big(T_1 \circ F_n(x_1), T_2 \circ F_n(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_n(x_1)\big) = \nabla\varphi\big(T_1 \circ F_n(x_1)\big) \qquad \forall x_1 \in F_n^{-1}(A_\gamma). \tag{6}$$

It follows that

$$D_1c\big(x_1, T_2 \circ F_n(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_n(x_1)\big) = \nabla\varphi\big(x_1\big) \qquad \forall x_1 \in \cap_{n=1}^{m+1} F_n^{-1}(A_\gamma),\ \forall n \leq m+1. \tag{7}$$

Since $\varrho_n(X_1 \setminus A_\gamma) = 0$ and ϱ_n is a probability measure we have that $\varrho_n(A_\gamma) = 1$. Note that $\varrho_n(A_\gamma) = \mu\big(F_n^{-1}(A_\gamma)\big)$ and therefore $\mu_1\big(\cap_{n=1}^{m+1} F_n^{-1}(A_\gamma)\big) = 1$. This together with (7) yield that

$$D_1c\big(x_1, T_2 \circ F_n(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_n(x_1)\big) = \nabla\varphi\big(x_1\big) \qquad \forall x \in \bar{A}_\gamma, \tag{8}$$

where $\bar{A}_\gamma = \cap_{n=1}^{m+1} F_n^{-1}(A_\gamma)$. Note that by condition (i) in Proposition 3.1 we have $\mu(B_{m+1}) > 0$. Take $x_1 \in \bar{A}_\gamma \cap B_{m+1}$. It follows from the m-twist condition on splitting sets that the cardinality of

$$L_{x_1} := \Big\{(x_1, y) \in S;\, D_1c\big(x_1, T_2 \circ F_1(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_n(x_1)\big) = D_1c\big(x_1, y\big)\Big\},$$

is at most m. On the other hand it follows from (8) that $\big(x_1, T_2 \circ F_n(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_n(x_1)\big) \in L_{x_1}$ for all $n \in \{1, ..., m+1\}$. Thus, there exist $i < j \leq m+1$ such that $\big(T_2 \circ F_i(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_i(x_1)\big) = \big(T_2 \circ F_j(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_j(x_1)\big)$. Since $T_1 \circ F_i = T_1 \circ F_j = Id_{X_1}$ and the map $T = (T_1, T_2, ..., T_n)$ is injective it follows that $F_i(x_1) = F_j(x_1)$. This is a contradiction as $x_1 \in B_j \subseteq B_{m+1}$ from which the claim follows.
By the latter claim we have that $k \leq m$. It then follows from Proposition 3.1 that every $\varrho \in K_\gamma$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the measure $\sum_{i=1}^k \varrho_i$ where $\varrho_i = F_{i\#}\mu$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. For every $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ it follows from (2) that

$$\mu_1(B) = \int_{ext\, M(T_1, \mu_1)} \varrho(B)\, d\xi(\varrho) = \int_{K_\gamma} \varrho(B)\, d\xi(\varrho),$$

from which we obtain that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\sum_{i=1}^k \varrho_i$. It follows that $d\mu / d(\sum_{i=1}^k \varrho_i) = \alpha(x)$ for some measureble non-negative function α. Assume that $F_1, ..., F_k$ are $(\mathcal{B}(X_1)_\mu, \mathcal{B}(X))$-measurable sections of the mapping T_1 with $\varrho_i = F_{i\#}\mu_1$. Setting $\alpha_i = \alpha \circ F_i$, it follows from $T_{1\#}\mu_1 = \mu_1$ that $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i(x) = 1$ for μ_1-a.e. $x \in X_1$. It also follows from Corollary 6.7.6 in [1] that each F_i is μ_1-a.e. equal to a $(\mathcal{B}(X_1), \mathcal{B}(X_1))$-measurable function still denoted by F_i. For each $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$, let $G_i = \big(T_2 \circ F_i, ..., T_n \circ F_i\big)$. We now show that $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (\mathrm{Id} \times G_i)_\# \mu$. For each bounded continuous function $f : X_1 \times Y \to \mathbb{R}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{X_1 \times Y} f(x, y)\, d\gamma = \int_{X_1} f(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1)\, d\mu_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{X_1} \alpha(x_1) f(T_1x_1, T_2x_1, ..., T_nx_1)\, d\varrho_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{X_1} \alpha\big(F_i(x_1)\big) f\big(T_1 \circ F_i(x_1), T_2 \circ F_i(x_1), ..., T_n \circ F_i(x_1)\big)\, d\mu_1 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{X_1} \alpha_i(x) f\big(x_1, G_i(x_1)\big)\, d\mu_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (\mathrm{Id} \times G_i)_\# \mu$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1.2 goes in the same lines as the proof of Theorem 1.3 and the only difference is that by using the same argument one obtains $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ instead of being bounded by m as in the case of the m-twist condition.

We conclude this section by proving the generalized-twist property for the locally 1-twisted costs.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Assume that $S \subset X_1 \times ... \times X_n$ is a c-splitting set. Fix $(\bar{x}_1, ..., \bar{x}_n) \in S$. We need to show that the set

$$L = \Big\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in S;\, D_1c(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, ..., \bar{x}_n) = D_1c(\bar{x}_1, x_2, ...x_n)\Big\},$$

is finite. If L is not finite there exists an infinitely countable subset $\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2^k, ...x_n^k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset L$. Since S is compact then the sequence $\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2^k, ...x_n^k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ has an accumulation point $(\bar{x}_1, x_2^0, ...x_n^0) \in S$ and there exists a subsequence still denoted by $\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2^k, ...x_n^k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $x_i^k \to x_i^0$ as $k \to \infty$ for $i = 2, ..., n$. Since D_1c is

continuous it follows that $(\bar{x}_1, x_2^0, ...x_n^0) \in L$. Since c is locally 1-twisted on S, this leads to a contradiction as $(\bar{x}_1, x_2^0, ...x_n^0)$ is an accumulation point of the sequence $\{(\bar{x}_1, x_2^k, ...x_n^k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and

$$D_1 c(\bar{x}_1, x_2^0, ...x_n^0) = D_1 c(\bar{x}_1, x_2^k, ...x_n^k), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This completes the proof. □

References

[1] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure theory. Vol. I, II.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[2] G. Buttazzo, L. De Pascale, and P. Gori-Giorgi. *Optimal transport formulation of electronic density-functional theory.* Phys. Rev. A, 85:062502, Jun 2012.

[3] G. Carlier, *On a class of multidimensional optimal transportation problems.* J. Convex Anal., 10(2): 517-529, 2003.

[4] G. Carlier, B. Nazaret, *Optimal transportation for the determinant,* ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 14 (2008), no. 4, 678-698.

[5] P.-A. Chiappori, R. J. McCann, L. P. Nesheim, *Hedonic price equilibria, stable matching, and optimal transport: equivalence, topology, and uniqueness.* Econom. Theory 42 (2010) 317-354.

[6] W. Gangbo and A. Swiech. *Optimal maps for the multidimensional mongekantorovich problem.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 51(1):23-45, 1998.

[7] N. Ghoussoub and A. Moameni. *A Self-dual Polar Factorization for Vector Fields.* Comm. Pure. Applied. Math., Vol 66, Issue 6 (2013) p. 905-933.

[8] S. Graf, *Induced -homomorphisms and a parametrization of measurable sections via extremal preimage measures.* Math. Ann. 247 (1980), no. 1, 67-80.

[9] H. Heinich. *Probleme de Monge pour n probabilities.* C.R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 334(9):793-795, 2002.

[10] Y-H Kim, B. Pass . *A general condition for Monge solutions in the multi-marginal optimal transport problem.* arXiv:1307.6293

[11] V. Levin, *Abstract cyclical monotonicity and Monge solutions for the general Monge-Kantorovich problem.* Set-Valued Analysis, 7(1):7-32, 1999.

[12] A. Moameni, *A characterization for solutions of the Monge-Kantorovich mass transport problem.* Submitted.

[13] A. Moameni, B. Pass, *Solutions to multi-marginal optimal transport problems supported on several graphs.* In preparation.

[14] B. Pass. *Uniqueness and monge solutions in the multimarginal optimal transportation problem.* SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 43(6):2758-2775, 2011.

[15] B. Pass. *On the local structure of optimal measures in the multimarginal optimal transportation problem.* Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations, 43:529-536, 2012.

[16] K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao, M. Bhaskara Rao, *A Remark on Nonatomic Measures.* Ann. Math. Statist. V. 43, 1 (1972), 369-370.

[17] C. Villani, *Optimal transport, Old and new.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

[18] H. von Weizsäcker, G. Winkler, *Integral representation in the set of solutions of a generalized moment problem.* Math. Ann. 246 (1979/80), no. 1, 23-32.